



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

POLICE DEPARTMENT MURAL ROOM

MONDAY

OCTOBER 8, 2007

7:00 P.M.

- CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stopper at 7:01 p.m.
- PRESENT:** GPAC Members Batinich, Bushala, Durette, Fitzgerald, Griffin, Heusser (arrived at 7:22 p.m.), Richmond, Savage, and Stopper
- ABSENT:** Excused: GPAC Members Bennett, Buck, Haley, Jaramillo, Lambros
Unexcused: GPAC Member Harrell
- STAFF PRESENT:** Director Godlewski, Acting Chief Planner Eastman, Senior Planner St. Paul, Secretary Pasillas
- CONSULTANT PRESENT:** RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist, RBF Community Planner Michelle Kou
- FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman Stopper
- MINUTES:** MOTION made by Vice Chairman Griffin, SECONDED by Committee Member Savage, and CARRIED unanimously, by voting members present and with Members Fitzgerald and Richmond abstaining, that the Minutes of the September 10, 2007 meeting be APPROVED as modified (page 4, last paragraph change "developer" to "development", and page 7, second paragraph, "Richmond" school change to "Richman" school.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dr. Fred Johnson, 2308 E. Amerige Avenue, spoke of the need to encourage the preparedness of both the City and its citizens during the General Plan update process. He also described the "CERT" program and passed out brochures.

Pete Baron, 1219 W. Baker, spoke of wanting to see his neighborhood like it was in the 1950's and 1960's. He believed the idea of a "block community" should be looked at during the update process.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Overview of Process

David Barquist, RBF, gave a brief presentation of the update process. He explained that the end product would be a comprehensive policy document that was reflective of the community's concerns. The process of getting to that point would be a public process that would involve numerous discussions. A schematic of the process was shown and the steps described.

Chairman Stopper asked Mr. Barquist to describe the process that went on during the community charrette's. Mr. Barquist stated that the visioning report that had been provided to the Members at the last meeting was a summary of all the previous community meetings. At these community meetings, there was an open forum discussion and then an opportunity for the individuals to anonymously list what they considered the treasures, challenges, and visions for Fullerton. They were also given an opportunity to attempt a draft of a vision statement. Chairman Stopper clarified that RBF had taken the raw input and created the vision report, and Mr. Barquist confirmed that everything listed in the report was from the community input.

Committee Member Richmond asked who had divided the items into topics and themes, and Mr. Barquist responded that RBF did the preliminary draft that would then be discussed by the Committee.

Committee Member Heusser believed that the words listed by the community members at these charrette's could be taken out of context since there was not additional description. Mr. Barquist responded that they had spoken with the community members at these meetings and taken additional notes to help them understand the context.

Committee Member Batinich asked if people had signed their names to the sticky notes and Mr. Barquist responded that they had not. Committee Member Batinich asked if there could be duplicate ideas listed because the same people attended several meetings. Mr. Barquist did not believe this was a problem, and that people were good at self-regulating themselves and only participating at one meeting. Committee Member Savage commented that there appeared to be a community activist group that had attended every community meeting to voice their opinion. He wanted to know how their opinion was separated from the others or weight placed on it. Mr. Barquist stated that the groups had not been identified to them, and that none of the ideas had been weighted or ranked.

Committee Member Durette believed that the number of people who had attended these events were not representative of the City. She had concern with such a small group of citizens putting together the topics and themes, and wanted to know if this was typical in other cities. Mr. Barquist explained that it wasn't typical, nor was it unusual. Smaller communities tended to have more community involvement. He also explained that a scientific, non-biased telephone survey was being prepared to gain additional opinions.

Committee Member Bushala commented that when he participated in the 1986 General Plan update the participation in the process was about the same.

Chairman Stopper believed that staff was working diligently to try and reach out to the community, and there could be a variety of reasons for the lack of involvement. Mr. Barquist added that approximately 120 unique individuals had attended the various meetings and they hoped to survey approximately 500 with the telephone survey.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Mr. Baron had attended some of the community meetings and did not like the methodology used. He believed the questions and answers needed to be more specific.

Ginger Britt, 2838 Birch Place, would like to see events held at each of the schools. She believed it would be good to notify the parents and get them involved, especially now that school was in session.

Judith Kaluzny, 400 N. Malden, suggested asking the public in attendance tonight if they had gone to more than one charette, and Chairman Stopper responded that this was not the time to take surveys.

Definition of Sustainability

Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that this item had been added to the agenda based on a discussion at the previous GPAC meeting, and a draft definition was presented to the Committee. Sustainability was a broad topic that encompassed many items and issues, and he hoped to help the community develop a mutual understanding of what the concept of sustainability meant to they could use that definition in future discussions. He requested each Committee Member to give their definition and thoughts on sustainability.

Committee Member Richmond believed the definition presented was too wordy. He also did not understand the need to use the words “current” and “future” in the definition since this update was only for the next ten years.

Committee Member Bushala commented on the many uses of the word. He would like to address the word in the context of planning for the future with sustainable development, using sustainable building materials and not wasting valuable natural resources such as clay, concrete, and gypsum.

Committee Member Batinich compared the City to a family and discussed meeting the basic needs of the City, water, maintenance of the City and schools, etc., while remaining realistic and balanced. He also believed it was important to ensure there was enough funding to meet these needs.

Committee Member Savage discussed building a foundation for sustainability. He believed it was important to encourage business growth in Fullerton so as to attract more business and professional people to the City. He believed that this type of person would provide more money for cultural activities and charity, and also they tended to have good property management. If the City paid more attention to this group of people it would bring more money into the community to support other activities.

Committee Member Heusser liked the definition that had been provided on the “Topic & Themes” chart – Meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Committee Member Fitzgerald agreed with Committee Member Savage and Committee Member Heusser, and believed there was not enough discussion on the economic growth part of the equation. She did not believe the City could remain how it was today and remain sustainable. She wanted to see a reasonable and balanced plan.

Committee Member Durette liked the draft definition.

Vice Chairman Griffin also was comfortable with the draft definition.

Chairman Stopper stated that he had “googled” sustainability earlier in the day and came up with a definition similar to Committee Member Heusser. He suggested “Be good stewards of the resources available to us so they will be here for future generations”. He also liked the draft definition.

Committee Member Bushala liked the draft definition but wanted to add “architectural design” or “maintenance-free design” to it. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that at this point the Committee was not trying to fine tune the definition, just come up with a general, conceptual definition and understanding.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Bruce Hostetter, a member of the public, stated that to him sustainability was a broad subject. In response to Committee Member Savage’s comment, he stated that responsible development encouraged responsible businesses to move to our community, since those were the businesses making the investment and commitment to green building. He continued by explaining that when you thought of sustainability, generally it had to do economics, the environment, and society and the people. One perspective that needed to be looked at was can you afford it. In the sustainable perspective you needed to look at the life cycle cost; if I put more money in this building now, maybe in three to five years it will pay back. Everyone benefits from reduced resource consumption, and the definition continually changes. He believed that a model for sustainability was nature, and discussed the zero waste movement. In nature had no landfills, everything was used in some way. Sustainability was a large subject, and in addition to the things mentioned things like environmentally friendly procurement, i.e. is the paper we use recycled, transportation, i.e. the type of vehicles the City uses, needed to be looked at.

Mr. Johnson wanted to see survivability added to the topics, and the City have a better preparation for disaster.

Ms. Kaluzny stated , in response to Committee Member Savage’s comments, that the last time the City cut the red tape was in December 2002 when they abolished Conditional Use Permits (CUP’s) for restaurants in the downtown area. It was now costing the City over one million dollars above what taxes brought in. There were a number of restaurants washing their mats into the public water ways. Another downfall was more restaurants moved to Fullerton and drove up the lease prices so that other, “normal”, businesses could not afford to move into the area.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman concluded this topic with a recap of key words mentioned, and stated that sustainability was not the end product but ongoing, therefore requiring change.

Review/Discussion of Revised Themes

Mr. Barquist discussed the “Topic Area” chart that had been provided to the Committee. He asked the Committee to review each one and determine if it accurately represented the treasurers, challenges, and visions that had been presented in the draft visioning report. He then asked the Committee to use post-it notes to add any other topics that they believed needed to be represented.

At the conclusion of this activity, Mr. Barquist explained that he would record these comments and provide them to the Committee at the end of this week, so that they would have a starting point for the next meeting.

AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be November 5, 2007 at 7:00 p.m., at which the Committee would receive an update on the outreach process, finalize the themes and topics, and review / discuss the draft Vision Statement.

An additional meeting was scheduled for December 10, 2007 at which the Committee would draft the General Plan structure. From December 2007 through summer 2008 the Committee would work on land use alternatives and the draft General Plan element revisions.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Update on Outreach Activities

Mr. Barquist gave an overview of the various outreach programs that had been held so far, and proposed future events.

Committee Member Heusser suggested that the Mayor announce the survey during the City Council meeting since those meetings were televised to the public.

Chairman Stopper invited members of the public to offer Public Comment on this item.

Ms. Kaluzny suggested sending flyers home through the schools, and Barbara suggested adding a notice in the water bill.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman advised the Committee that, based on a previous Committee discussion, the City Attorney was available to attend the next meeting and discuss conflicts of interest if they so desired. He explained that as individuals they needed to decide any conflict of interest issues and that the City Attorney was available to them.

Chairman Stopper wanted the City Attorney at the next meeting to ensure that all questions were answered. Committee Member Fitzgerald, Savage, and Bushala all believed that it was unnecessary to have the City Attorney at the meeting and that individuals could contact the City Attorney if they so desired. It was decided to wait until the next meeting and see if all Committee Members had their questions resolved.

Acting Chief Planner Eastman gave an update on the Housing Element. He explained that there was a regional housing requirement and the process was very stringent as it related to the State. The City was going out for RFP's, and as soon as the contract had been awarded the Housing Element would be brought to the GPAC for review. The State required receipt of the update of the Housing Element for their review by June 2008.

Chairman Stopper clarified that the Housing Element would need to go before both the Planning Commission and the City Council for approval prior to being sent to the State, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman confirmed the process. He added that the State was very specific in its requirement and the City hoped to move forward quickly. Director Godlewski commented that staff would move forward as quickly as possible.

Number of Website hits for on-line survey

Mr. Barquist stated that five people had participated in the online survey.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.